

the west coast, making it uneconomic for domestic oil producers to invest in marginal operations.

Mr. President, a Department of Energy study confirms that lifting the ban on Alaskan crude oil would improve domestic energy security by encouraging domestic exploration activities. DOE estimates that domestic production will increase between 100,000 and 110,000 barrels a day if the ban is lifted.

In addition to increasing domestic production, this bill will also help to stabilize the decline in the size and vitality of the domestic merchant marine.

By authorizing the exports of Alaskan oil on U.S.-flag vessels, we can help preserve a vital element of our domestic merchant marine, and we can do so without subsidies from the American taxpayer and without measurably increasing any risk to the environment.

Mr. President, in 1990, Congress overwhelmingly supported enactment of the Oil Pollution Act. That legislation ultimately will require all oceangoing tankers plying our waters to be built or rebuilt with a double hull. It already ensures that American flag and foreign flag tankers will continue to be subject to the same strict safety requirements. And since December 28 of last year, it has imposed substantial financial responsibility requirements for all tankers entering U.S. waters.

Last year, the Department of Energy conducted an extensive study of the likely effects, including likely environmental implications, of changing the current law. The Department, and I quote:

Found no plausible evidence of any direct negative environmental impact from lifting the ANS export ban.

By and large, Mr. President, the same U.S.-built, U.S.-owned, and U.S.-crewed vessels that carry Alaskan oil to market today will continue to carry the crude to market tomorrow with a change in policy. The same skilled merchant mariners will continue to man the vessels. Current Department of Defense and Department of Transportation projections indicate that we are facing a critical shortage of trained mariners capable of manning the ready reserve force. This bill will help ensure that we will continue to have a reservoir of capably trained mariners sufficient to man our reserve fleet in time of national emergency. And our Nation will continue to have access to a fleet of environmentally safe and militarily useful vessels that otherwise are destined to be converted into razor blades.

By enacting this bipartisan legislation, we can help ensure the continued existence of the largest segment of our domestic merchant marine. Let us demonstrate again that we can work together to help promote our energy security, our national security, and at the same time preserve jobs.

Mr. President and my colleagues, I will just add a couple of remarks and

point out that again this ban was enacted at a time when this country literally was on its knees from the standpoint of energy requirements. The Middle Eastern oil nations had banded together to form cartels which restricted amounts of oil being exported to the United States in particular.

We all remember the long lines that occurred in the 1970's when people had to wait in line to buy gasoline for their automobiles and vehicles. Everyone in America wanted Congress to do something about it. One of the things that we did was to say, all right, we are not going to allow any of the Alaska North Slope oil exported to other countries. We are going to keep it right here.

Mr. President, I think we probably acted with some degree of haste in taking that action and in thinking that by doing so we were somehow going to increase the domestic production. I think in reality we should all understand that oil is a commodity which can be traded all over the world; that, indeed, many ships that are plying the oceans filled with oil are sent to different ports in the middle of a voyage depending on the need because the price is better in one area or the need is greater in another area or for whatever economic determination that is made.

So the point is that oil is traded on the world market according to need and price. If we can, indeed, take some of the crude oil in Alaska and sell it at a better price in overseas markets, we should be allowed to do that. The price return will allow greater domestic production in areas of the United States where that production can occur.

I am a Senator from the State of Louisiana. I have nothing to do with oil, of course, that is produced in Alaska. But I think this is good policy for my State, for the State of Alaska, and indeed for all of the States in the United States. I think it will increase production, and it will not do damage to any part of our Nation. It is good economic energy policy for the future of our country.

Mr. President and my colleagues, I hope we would move on this. It should be relatively noncontroversial. I know some Members have legitimate concerns, and they will be heard, but I think we should move forward, debate the issue, vote on this legislation, and ultimately we should adopt it as good energy policy.

Having said that, Mr. President, seeing no one else seeking recognition at the moment, I would suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been noted. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAMS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent to proceed as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORE POLICE ON THE STREETS

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I rise this afternoon to continue my discussion of the crime bill that I intend to introduce this Wednesday.

As I previously pointed out, there are really two basic questions that we need to address in the area of crime whenever we try to determine whether a crime bill is good or whether it is not good, whether it does the job or whether it does not do the job.

The first question is: What is the proper role of the Federal Government in fighting crime in this country? The second is: What really works in law enforcement? What matters? What does not matter?

Last Wednesday, I discussed these issues with specific reference to crimefighting technology. The conclusion I reached was that we have an outstanding technology base in this country that does a great deal and will continue to do a great deal to help us catch criminals.

Technology, Mr. President, does in fact matter. But we need the Federal Government to be more proactive, more proactive in getting the States on line with this technology. Having a terrific national criminal record system or a huge DNA database or an automated fingerprint system or huge DNA database for convicted sex offenders in Washington, DC, is great; it is nice. But it will not do much good if the police officer in Hamilton, OH, or Middletown, OH, or Cleveland, OH, cannot tap into it, cannot put the information in, and cannot get the information back out.

My legislation would bring these local police departments on line. It would help them to contribute to and benefit from the emerging nationwide crimefighting database.

On this past Thursday, I discussed what we have to do to get armed career criminals off the streets, those who terrorize us, terrorize their fellow citizens with a gun. I talked about a program called Project Triggerlock that targeted gun criminals for Federal prosecution. My legislation would bring back Project Triggerlock and toughen the laws on gun crimes in many other significant ways. We have to get these armed criminals off the streets.

On Friday, I talked about the long neglected needs of crime victims. In too many ways, our legal system treats criminals like victims and victims like criminals. We have to stop that. My legislation contains a number of provisions that would make the system much more receptive to the rights and the needs of crime victims.

Today, I would like to turn to another item. I would like to talk about

what we can do to put more police officers on the street, and to put more police officers into our highest crime areas. Make no mistake, the evidence is clear, putting a police officer on a street corner in a dangerous neighborhood will reduce crime. We are looking for what really works, and putting police officers on the streets is a proven strategy that works. It is a plain fact, if you put a police officer on the street, crime will go down.

The President is right in this respect, and he is to be commended for understanding that there is, in fact, a direct or actually inverse relationship between the number of law enforcement officers who are deployed correctly in the neighborhood and the amount of crime that exists in that neighborhood.

That is why the President last year asked for \$8.8 billion in Federal funding for police officers. We do need more police; he is correct. Police officers deployed correctly matter. They do make a difference.

But, Mr. President, I believe that we can improve on President Clinton's plan, and there are three major shortcomings I believe that exist in the President's plan that we ought to address in the Senate. Let me list them:

First, the administration's plan spreads the \$8.8 billion far too thin. It does not target the funding for police officers to the most crime-ridden areas where the funding is most needed. Instead, it spends money on extra police officers even—even in extremely low-crime areas. That just does not make sense.

Second, the administration is not paying for the full cost of the extra police officers. The Clinton proposal pays for only 75 percent of the police officers and asks local communities to come up with the remaining 25 percent.

Third, the Clinton plan provides the money for only—only, Mr. President—3 years.

I think that these problems I have just listed with the Clinton administration proposal can be fixed fairly easily. As part of the comprehensive crime legislation I intend to introduce on Wednesday, I will be including my proposals on how we should fix these problems, and here is what I propose:

First, I propose to pay for the police officers and to pay for them in full, 100 percent. Under my proposal, we will send \$5 billion over a period of time to the local communities for new police officers. Those police officers will be fully funded 100 percent, not just 75 percent, as envisioned in the Clinton plan.

Second, we will fund these police officers for 5 years; 5 years, not 3 years, as envisioned by the Clinton proposal.

Third, and probably most significant, my proposal will target these funds where they are needed the most. Under the Clinton plan, really crime-threatened communities are deprived of the full contingent of police officers they really need. For example, under the administration proposal, a high-crime

community, such as Chicago, has received 300 police officers so far, and those 300 are not even fully funded. They are funded at 75 percent. My legislation would put 2,100 new police officers on the streets of Chicago and would pay for them in full.

I can cite example after example. Let me just give one from my home State. Youngstown, OH, is another city with a very serious crime problem. Under the Clinton plan, it has received a total of 10 new police officers. I think, however, to make a real difference in a crime area, we need to do better than that. Under the formula that is contained in the bill that I will introduce on Wednesday, there would be a total of 58 new police officers on the streets of Youngstown. We would go from 10 under the Clinton plan to 58 under my plan, and the way we are able to do that is because we are targeting the money to go to the areas where the crime is the worst. It only makes sense that when we are dealing with scarce Federal dollars, those Federal dollars should be targeted specifically to the areas where our citizens are most in danger.

My proposal would put the dollars for police officers where police officers are needed the most. We are targeting the 250 most crime-infested cities in America. We will succeed in getting those police officers on the street. In a community brutalized by rampant crime, the police officer is truly an ambassador of law and order. The police officer is a living, breathing confirmation of America's resolve to defend civilization from those who want to turn our country into a wasteland of stealing, raping, and killing.

The police officer is a soldier of justice, and like any other soldier, the police officer, to be most effective, needs to be sent where the enemy is. The enemy is anyone who does a drive-by shooting or rapes someone or commits any other kind of brutal act.

Mr. President, anyone who watches TV or reads the papers knows where the enemy really is. My bill would make sure that the police officers are deployed where they are needed the most. My bill would pay for them in full.

This is what it will take. This is what it will take if we are serious about taking back our streets.

The American people are, quite frankly, losing patience with violent crime. They are losing patience with the syndrome that my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from New York, calls defining deviancy down.

There is a consensus out here, Mr. President, that we will not allow our country to become a place where violent crime is considered normal. I think that putting these police officers on the street—and paying for them in full—will be a major symbol of our national resolve.

My legislation, Mr. President, would spend \$5 billion on these police officers, target them where they are needed the

most, and pay for these police officers in full.

The Clinton administration plan included \$8.8 billion as partial payment for police officers, with their deployment of police officers being spread throughout the country and spread among many, many areas where crime is not that serious.

Tomorrow, Mr. President, I will discuss what we can do with this extra \$3.8 billion, and specifically how we can use block grants to give local communities the flexibility they need to use that \$3.8 billion as effectively as possible. And then on Wednesday of this week, Mr. President, I will be introducing my comprehensive crime bill.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. FEINGOLD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

TERMINATION OF THE HELIUM AND OTHER PROGRAMS

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I want to take a few moments to praise both the House and Senate Budget Committees for including in their budget assumptions termination of a relatively small program, the helium reserve program. The Budget Committee materials assume a \$27 million savings over 5 years from termination of the helium reserve program.

As the budget debate unfolds in the House and Senate in the coming week, there will certainly be considerable debate over programs of enormous magnitude—programs with budget outlays in the billions, not millions. Although the Budget Committee materials assume a \$27 million savings from termination of the helium reserve program, the actual savings will be significantly higher as the Federal Government sells off the existing helium reserve over a period of time that will not disrupt the private helium market, as well as terminates the program itself. The Federal Government is currently stockpiling enough helium to meet its needs for the next 80 to 100 years. In order to make sure that the taxpayers get a fair price for this helium, the reserve needs to be sold over a period of time to make sure that we do not inadvertently cause the entire market price for helium to fall needlessly. CBO has estimated that we can, at current market prices, eventually recover between \$1 and \$1.6 billion by this sale.

It is not just the current \$27 million in savings but a long-term savings by in effect privatizing this area of our Government.

I introduced legislation, S. 45, to terminate this program on the first day of the 104th Congress. I am pleased to report that this legislation has gained bipartisan support and that it has been cosponsored by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. LAUTENBERG], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. KYL], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS], the